

# THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. VI

NEW YORK, APRIL 12, 1913

No. 22

In 1888 F. A. Stokes and Brother brought out an imitation of a Roman *volumen*, entitled *Carmina Octo Q. Horatii Flacci edidit Georgius Vincent*, which in the form of a 'parchment' scroll gave first the text of eight Odes of Horace, printed in capitals, then translations into English. The scroll consisted of three sheets of parchment paper, each about thirty inches long, pasted together; on the back the parchment was colored a light red. The Odes and the translations were printed side by side, of course, and lines were ruled to right and to left of each 'page'. There were two title pages, one in Latin, one in English. After the Latin title page came a 'portrait' (an *imago*) of Horace. The right hand end of the scroll was fastened permanently to a wooden rod, which had two projecting knobs or bosses; the bosses and the main stick were, apparently, all in one piece. The bosses were painted white: the stick itself was invisible. There was no rod at the left hand end. Originally a *titulus* was attached to the scroll.

On the whole, on the principle laid down by Horace *Ars Poetica* 180-181, *Segnius irritant animos demissa per aurem quam quae sunt oculis subiecta fidelibus*, the scroll was likely to be of real service in helping pupils to visualize the Roman *volumen*. Unfortunately, however, no more copies are obtainable at the publishers'. For a chance to examine a copy I am indebted to the kindness of Miss Lydia M. Dame of the Girl's High School, Brooklyn.

Since 1888 a good deal of attention has been devoted to Roman books. An important work in this field is Theodor Birt's *Die Buchrolle in der Kunst* (352 pages, 190 illustrations: Teubner, 1907. 15 Marks), which bears the sub-title *Archäologisch-Antiquarische Untersuchungen zum Antiken Buchwesen*. According to the Preface it was intended to supplement the same author's *Das Antike Buchwesen*, published in 1882. It is not my intention to review the work on the *Buchrolle* at this late day: it was reviewed briefly in *Classical Philology* 6.116, and in *The Classical Review* 23.56. I seek at present to direct attention just to one part of Birt's later book: from that some hint may be had of the value of the work as a whole.

Martial, 1.66, addressing a plagiarist of his poems,

humorously offers to sell him an unpublished poem and guarantees to keep silence about the transaction. It costs more, says Martial, to be a poet than the mere outlay for a scroll and the expense of copying. Further, if the plagiarist must steal, he had better make an arrangement with someone who has unpublished poems yet under lock and key, for *mutare dominum non potest liber notus*. Sed *pumicata fronte si quis est nondum nec umbilicis cultus atque membrana*, *mercari: tales habeo nec sciet quisquam*. The colored back of the Horatian scroll, mentioned above, was meant to represent the *membrana*; that scroll, however, had but a single *umbilicus* (and this, according to Birt, was un-Roman). It seems worth while to transcribe the note on *umbilicis* in our Martial passage to be found in Professor Post's edition (Ginn and Co., 1908).

According to the view commonly held the *pl. umbilici* denoted the projecting ends or knobs, colored or gilded, attached to the cylinder (*umbilicus*) to which the right end of the scroll was attached and on which the scroll was rolled; cf. 8.61.4-5 *nec umbilicis quod decorus et cedro spargor per omnes Roma quas tenet gentes*; 3.2.9; 4.89.1-2 *libelle, iam pervenimus usque ad umbilicos*; 11.107.1-2 *explicitum nobis usque ad sua cornua librum* . . . refers; . . . But Birt, *Buchrolle*, 228-235, holds that the *umbilicus* was not fastened to the roll and that it did not project beyond the *frontes*; it was merely inserted in the roll and was removable at will. When one unwound a scroll as he read, he could shift the *umbilicus* to form a center for the part read as he wound this up loosely. The use of two *umbilici* began in Domitian's time. Before the reading began both were within the roll; as the reading progressed one was allowed to remain in the roll, the other was inserted in the part read.

In his detailed discussion Birt points out that very few *Rollenstäbe* have been found: the few discovered, he says, come from Herculaneum, "*Der Durchmesser solchen Stabes ist 15 mm lang; das Stäbchen zeigt im Innern bald eine hellere Masse (medulla) von 5 mm Durchmesser, bald einen entsprechenden Hohlraum*". There is much evidence in art that the reader did not use the *umbilicus* at all in rolling up the volume; to roll up the scroll he held it by the middle or "*am Fuss*".

Birt now turns to the literature to see what light he can derive therefrom. Cicero, though he says

much of the manufacture of books, never mentions the *umbilicus*. Greek literature knows nothing of it (them) till the second Christian century. Only the Roman poets speak of it (them), and that too only when they are speaking of unusual volumes, such as presentation copies. "Grade sie bewiesen, dass der *umbilicus* im Lesebuch nicht das Gewöhnliche war". In Catullus 22 Suffenus shows himself by various things, among which are *novi umbilici* (7), "eitle Narr". Birt notes next that the works of art figured and discussed in his book give no hint whatever of the *umbilicus*.

In support of his doctrine that the *umbilicus* was not attached to the roll, but only laid in the roll when it was complete to form a solid center for the rolled-up volume, Birt quotes Porphyry on Horace Epod. 14.8: in fine libri *umbilici* ex ligno aut osse solent poni; the verb used, it will be noted, is *poni*, not *aptari* or *adsui* or *agglutinari*. So Lucian, *Adversus Indoctum* 16, in a similar connection has the phrase *ὀμφαλοῖς ἐντιθέσθαι*; the verb *ἐντιθέσθαι* is used, for example, of putting one's foot in a shoe. When one began to read, he left the *umbilicus* in its original place, or else pulled it out with his left hand and then wrapped around it the part of the book he had read.

Birt then argues that his explanation of the *umbilicus* as something detachable helps us at last to explain Catullus 22. Suffenus has an epic poem in 10,000 verses. This he carries about in ten scrolls, of new paper of the best sort; for these he uses *novi umbilici*, one for each volume. "Als besondere Luxus gilt hier, dass der Dichter sogar 'neue' Stäbchen nimmt". It follows that ordinarily people were content to use old *umbilici*; they took the light *umbilici* out of old scrolls and put them into new volumes. Finally, from all this we see why the *umbilicus* was usually of gay colors or gilded. Such coloring or gilding would have been needless if the *umbilicus* were permanently attached to the scroll; in that case it would be entirely hidden from view (as the stick was hidden in our Horatian scroll). "Er lag vielmehr oft frei in der Hand" (the left hand).

The evidence for the use of two *umbilici* begins with Statius, *Silvae* 4.9.8; it is given more fully by Martial. Birt holds that his theory of the use of the two *umbilici* (see Professor Post, quoted above) at last makes it possible to explain Martial 5.6.15: *nigris pagina crevit umbilicis*. *pagina* here denotes the whole volume; this is in fact small (see verse 7), but it has grown "durch die beiden Stäbe; man meint, das Buch sei so stark an Papier; aber die Stäbe sind es, die es so aufblähen. Sie stecken beide im Innern". To realize the value of Professor Birt's discussion of the *umbilicus* one has only to examine the commentaries on Catullus and Martial or Vollmer's note on Statius, *Silvae* 4.9.8, or the unsatisfactory account on page 47 of the

new edition of E. Maunde Thompson's *An Introduction to Greek and Latin Palaeography* (Oxford Press, 1912). C. K.

#### LATIN PROSE COMPOSITION IN COLLEGE

The keen satisfaction with which I read in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 6.26-29 Dr. Mitchell's paper on The Teaching of Latin Prose Composition in the Secondary School has moved me to set down certain ideas and convictions concerning Latin prose composition in College, particularly prescribed Latin prose composition.

What of those students who would not *sua sponte* elect Latin prose composition? Are those teachers right who believe that they should be allowed to omit such a course? That belief may be a natural product of long and wearisome experience of prescribed composition with large, heterogeneous classes, containing every possible type of mind, from that of the thoroughly prepared student with a natural language sense and an industrious disposition, to a feather-weight product of an utterly inefficient school, with fixed conviction that any English verb form containing 'was' is surely passive. The teacher feels, justly, that he has been wasting his own time and that of the better students in an effort, practically without result, to bring the weak student up to the passing mark—of accomplishing more than that he long ago abandoned hope. The executive authority, after foiling an innumerable series of attempts, naïve, brazen, or guilefully subtle, to beat the regulations and to secure the palm without the dust of labor may be pardoned for sharing the view of the grieved or resentful student that Latin prose composition is an incubus, a blot on the curriculum. Hence arises a situation, somewhat surprising at first glance, in which the teachers of Latin and the executive authority concur in abolishing prescribed Latin composition, while their scientific colleagues, who have enjoyed in the mental development of the students the results of the toil of the teachers of Latin composition, regret the loss of the course.

To my way of thinking, these teachers of science are not only right in regretting the passing of the assistance they derived from that source, but justified in expecting and demanding it. Latin composition should not be a privilege of those only who expect to carry on to a considerable extent the study of the Classics, although such students are undeniably less trying to teach. Any student whose mental caliber justifies coming to college at all as a candidate for the bachelor's degree is perfectly good material, under proper conditions, for a freshman course in Latin prose composition.

From a study of the school reports and entrance records of the 'lame ducks' of prescribed freshman prose and from personal inquiry and observation it has become evident that the sources of trouble for

students in such a prescribed course may be grouped under two general categories, to wit, defective preparation before entrance to college and unfortunate conditions within the college itself. Of the two, the former is probably the more largely operative. The reports show an astonishing number of students who have had no training whatever in Latin composition in the schools beyond that afforded by a beginning Latin book in the first year of their contact with the language. Many more have had only the most desultory and unsystematic training, scattered at intervals through their preparatory course, or else have been the victims of an attempt to 'cram' the necessary information (that something more than information is needed seems not to have occurred to them) in a much shorter period than even the five weeks which Dr. Mitchell condemns. The result of any of these types of defective preparation is easily imagined—a low mark at the entrance examination, a conviction on the part of the candidate and his parents that Latin prose is maliciously designed for the sole purpose of hampering a student's progress, and one more jar to the executive machinery of the college. This state of affairs arises more frequently in connection with Latin prose than with other subjects because parents, guardians and teachers will send boys and girls up for examination in Latin prose with a 'preparation' which they would never dream of considering adequate in any other subject. They would not expect a pupil who had gone no further than the elementary operations in algebra to pass an examination in 'quadratics and beyond', and, if they did send up a candidate who had tried to cover the whole ground in two weeks, or even two months, they would not be surprised at his failure to pass, nor would they charge such failure against the subject as a proof of its unreasonable and futile character.

Many freshmen enter College, then, conditioned in Latin prose, and convinced that in the condition they possess a grievance rather than a defect. If, in this state of mind, they are subjected within the College to conditions such as I have seen exist, conditions where the number of students under the charge of a single instructor rendered impossible not only individual attention to each student, but even any attempt at recitation by members of the class—where, in short, the course became, of necessity, a lecture course, attended by written exercises, to be examined in large masses and criticised in general terms—it is little wonder that their distaste for Latin composition and disbelief in its value are intensified.

The student gets no help from the lectures, he does not understand the corrections on his papers, his condition hangs on term after term. He feels that the course is not justifying itself because it does not teach him to pass off the condition. He

does not understand that he gets no help from the lectures *because* he has never really learned the things he needs in order to pass the entrance examination and so qualify to understand the lectures. Even where, by dint of looking up every form in the allotted exercise, and by shrewd guessing at the model to be followed among the 'examples' in his text-book, joined to an occasional glimmer of comprehension of what the instructor is talking about, he contrives to raise his term mark enough to balance a bad examination and to squeeze out of the course, it is quite possible for him to continue flunking an entrance examination where no prepared work supplements or corrects its results, and so fail to escape from the shadow of his entrance condition. This state of affairs looks very queer to the student, to his parents, and to the executive authorities aforesaid. They are all sure that something is wrong, and that the something must be prescribed Latin prose. Add to all this the fact that in such large and heterogeneous classes as I have described the instructor must choose between boring the really fit students and abandoning the attempt to help the unfit, and that he generally adopts a compromise which satisfies neither the fit nor the unfit nor himself, and we can readily understand the concurrence of that instructor in a proposal to abolish prescribed Latin prose composition.

True, there is a palliative measure possible—the sectioning of the class to do away with the curse of numbers, and sectioning on a basis of proficiency to cure the heterogeneity. This helps, but fails to heal. What the 'tail-enders' need is preparatory work, pure and simple. To give them that, and then credit them with having completed freshman prose is obviously unfair, whereas to push them through the necessary preparatory work and the proper freshman work in addition is impossible. Again, a compromise is inevitably adopted, with the usual unsatisfactory results.

What, then, is to be done?

Undoubtedly, if all preparatory work could be governed by the principles laid down in Dr. Mitchell's paper, the problem would not exist. Our freshmen would come to us ready for freshman prose. But that happy solution is unlikely. The spectacle of a class in prescribed freshman prose in which about 30 per cent were conditioned, about 10 per cent had an entrance mark of less than 45 is much more apt to occur. Taken in a mass, that class presents a really hopeless problem. Sectioned on a proficiency basis it can be handled fairly well in the better sections, though even these are apt to feel the drag of the instructor's desire to keep the two ends of the class near enough together to justify calling it a class. The true remedy is to refuse to the heavily conditioned students admission to the course, and then to section on a profi-



ciency basis, allowing not more than fifteen in a section, and assigning sufficient credit to the course to justify three or four hours of preparation on each weekly exercise. With sections of that size, containing only students who have attained a grade of at least 50 at entrance, the bugaboos of Latin prose composition vanish, for both pupil and instructor.

What is to become of those who fall below 50 at entrance examination? Well, if the College feels responsible for them, if it feels that it must give them an opportunity to get rid of the condition, it should surely provide that opportunity in some way that will not cripple the legitimate work of the freshman class. One thing is certain—that such students will feel much less entitled to a grievance against the College if they are squarely shut out of the course until their condition is removed, whether other provision is made for them or not, than they do when they are admitted and kept dragging along at the condition, term after term.

But what about those students who do other things well enough but are constitutionally unable to do Latin prose? The answer is that there are no such students. Only two things are necessary in order to proceed to a profitable contact with Latin composition; one is a knowledge of the ordinary forms of the language, and the other is the ability to think straight, or approximately so. A student who has not sufficient memory to learn the forms will find that lack of memory a bar to success in many other subjects, and the student whose inability to think straight makes Latin composition a hopeless muddle will find many other problems of College and of life assuming the same aspect.

If, then, the teachers of the Classics and the wielders of executive authority in Colleges will but recognize the true source of the terrors and entanglements associated with prescribed Latin prose composition, and direct their efforts to the stopping of those sources, if they will impress upon those who control the ante-collegiate career of the student the necessity of at least approximately adequate preparation in this subject (nothing enforces such a necessity more than a history of failures to 'get in' due to lack of the preparation), if, in a word, they will protect the course from impossible material, and then see that the work goes on under proper conditions of limited sections and an equitable allotment of credits—if they will steadfastly do all this, they will find most of the reasons for their own half-hearted or wholly lacking support of prescribed Latin prose removed, and their courage to resist the pressure of the merely lazy or essentially incompetent correspondingly increased.

That pressure must be resisted if we are to save for the student not primarily a classicist, just at the point where its results increase most rapidly in proportion to the effort employed, this efficient

means of developing, as Dr. Mitchell puts it, "reasoning power, memory, judgment, invention and resourcefulness". Much that Dr. Mitchell says of the study of Latin prose in preparatory schools is doubly true of the same study carried into the college course. As the work becomes more intensive, as the student grows more fit to learn whole truths and less satisfied with half truths, as he reads more Latin from a more mature point of view, above all, as he begins to work not only for correct syntax but for some measure of style and idiomatic expression as well, he wins in ever increasing proportion the reward of those by-products of Latin composition which are infinitely more valuable than is even the brightest student's slight skill in composition itself. These by-products Dr. Mitchell sums up (page 27) as follows: "Skill in reading Latin, accuracy in reasoning, directness and clearness of expression in English, and a *knowledge of the relation, proportion, and logical position of the parts of discourse—word, phrase, clause*—that nothing else can give".

I have italicized some words in the quotation because they come close to one result of studying Latin prose which seems to me never to have been sufficiently emphasized. Many will understand readily enough that the study of Latin prose will help in the reading of Latin and in the writing of English, but few will notice, unless their attention is called to the matter, how much it helps in the reading and hearing of English, in swiftness of comprehension and in keenness of enjoyment. There is nothing like handling for oneself, however amateurishly, the tools of a craft to bring appreciation of the mastercraftsman's work or correct judgment of the bungler's makeshift. Doubtless some, while admitting this fact, would contend that the tools handled should be English tools, as more easily obtainable and just as good. The trouble is, they are not as good—largely because they *are* more easily obtainable. In Latin the amateur workman gets his tools by finding out what he can do with each, one by one. He has to find that out before he can use the tool. In English he uses many of them instinctively, therefore uncomprehendingly, and all lie ready to his hand for careless or clumsy or reckless manipulation. It is only when he recognizes in them the same instruments whose true nature and power he has learned in Latin composition that he appreciates and respects them as he should, whether using them himself or watching their use by others. Thus indirectly through English composition, as well as directly, Latin composition sharpens the student's comprehension and enjoyment of English.

At this point again we may encounter an objection from those who admit that exercise in writing a foreign language is needed, but insist that a modern language should be chosen as *more* prac-

tical and just as good for this purpose. But, again, it is not as good. Composition work in a modern language is never as intensive as it is in Latin. In so far as the modern language more nearly approaches English it approaches also the defects of English as a means to this particular end. It is just because Latin is an ancient language, a fixed language (in the classical norm, at least) and a highly inflected language that it serves this purpose so well. It is ancient enough to give the student some perspective of historical grammar, it is fixed enough to serve as a point of departure and comparison, it is highly inflected enough to make him realize the firm framework which has become overlaid by the plastic covering of modern speech. Above all, it is definite, direct, precise. The editor of *The Nation* in a recent address, after stating that of the thousands of manuscripts submitted to him those produced by authors with a classical training were noticeably superior not only in finish and form but in the soundness of the thought itself, expressed his conviction that this superiority sprang from the authors' contact with the writings of great men who were *compelled* by the language in which they wrote to write clearly. That is it. You *may* write clearly in English, in French, in German—you *must* write clearly in Latin if you write at all (so too in Greek, as Dr. Rouse pointed out in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 6.17). And to write clearly in Latin what someone else has written in English, you must first determine exactly what the English sentences—vocabulary and syntax—mean.

My pupils had occasion recently to render in Latin the word 'safe'. In choosing between *incolumis* and *tutus* they discovered for the first time that the English word meant more than one thing. They seemed to find it a pleasing discovery, and straightway took that word *safe* in hand, scrutinized it minutely, tested it thoroughly and set it down at last with a satisfied nod. Practically every lesson brings up some such matter of vocabulary, many words proving far more interesting than the one cited, and I know it awakens a curiosity about words in general, a tendency to probe for their exact and various meanings, which cannot help adding a new zest and understanding to the reading of English.

In the field of syntax, too, the same sort of thing happens. To take a long, loose, ramshackle English sentence, to determine the interrelations, temporal and logical, of the thoughts of its various clauses and to express those relations in the cunningly articulated structure of a Latin period is an exercise not only delightful in itself, but fraught with happy consequences in an added power to savor the joys of deft fabric in fine English or to pluck the real meaning from less skillful sentences. Balance, antithesis, asyndeton, chiasmus, to name but a few of the simpler and more common arrange-

ments, have their full and true value in English for one who has used them however haltingly in Latin composition. I do not mean that he recognizes them by name, consciously and deliberately. When he reads, "He broke his coronation oath, but he took his little son upon his knee and kissed him", he does not say 'Yes, that is a balanced antithesis—I wrote something like that in Latin', but he does possess the meaning, he does experience the effect which Macaulay intended, with an immediateness, an absence of effort not to be otherwise enjoyed.

Doubtless many who would admit that years of practice in Latin writing, resulting in real proficiency, might give this perception of values in English would still be skeptical concerning such a claim for work of freshman grade. But it is precisely at this stage that this particular gift is granted most generously. The preparatory work scarcely reaches it, and advanced work, while constantly adding to it, lacks something of the initial impetus, the tingle of discovery.

It is true that the Latin sentences and paragraphs produced by the freshmen are still "not, as a product, worth six cents", but the production of them has brought a boon not to be measured in money. The relation between the objective achievement and the subjective gain is always illustrated to my mind by my experience in music. Up to my fifteenth year I had heard very little music of any sort. I could recognize familiar melodies, I liked a song if the words were interesting, and I liked a brass band. But I could not sing, I could not carry a tune. I can't yet. But when I went away to school a friend to whom I shall never cease to be grateful induced me to take some lessons in singing. The effort and sacrifice they cost have been royally repaid. I have learned to hear music, though I shall never make any myself. Doubtless much listening to good music, with proper explanations by a musician, would have helped me to hear, but it would have taken a long time and would not have accomplished the same end. The beauty of a single perfect tone, the marvellous significance of musical phrasing, the emotional quality of a cadence, the satisfying complexity of a fugue, the wealth of orchestral or choral harmonies, all these joys, precious beyond measuring, came to be mine out of those hours over the most elementary exercises and the simplest songs. Those hard-won lessons never made it possible for me to sing, but they did make it possible for me to count as one of the great and abiding happinesses of my life the hearing of the Ninth Symphony of Beethoven.

Just so a freshman course in Latin prose, though it produces no great writers, is still one gateway to beauty and happiness, a gateway which I would not only keep open for all candidates for the bachelor's degree, but into which I would resolutely thrust them as soon as they have mounted the steps

that lead to it. For they do not know, themselves, what lies beyond that gateway, and most of them will miss it if they are not helped.

BARNARD COLLEGE.

GRACE GOODALE.

### REVIEWS

Companion to Roman History. By H. Stuart Jones. Oxford: The Clarendon Press (1912). Pp. xii + 472. \$5.00.

In the preface Mr. Jones states that he has confined his field to subjects which can be illustrated from material remains, and has excluded those which may be adequately studied in manuals unprovided with illustrations. The book contains eight chapters of such subjects. The first and introductory chapter deals with the prehistoric peoples of Italy (with a map showing where remains of their settlements have been found); Roman surveying, and the development of the land and town system; roads and road-making, and sea-routes. This last section on Roman roads with the map to illustrate it is most excellent and might well be made into a separate chapter. In this first chapter there are some obscurities resulting from trying to cover a large amount of material briefly (compare the accounts of the development of Rome and Pompeii), and some statements which are open to question. On page 35 is one: "But if Rome thus began to vie with the great centres of the Hellenistic world (whose wealth it was rapidly draining)", etc.; if this refers to the second century B.C., as it seems to do, it is doubtful whether the Romans were then rapidly draining the wealth of the world. Inscriptions from Delos show that the Southern Italians had control of Mediterranean trade in the second century B.C. and well down into the first.

The other chapters deal with Architecture, War, Religion, Production and Distribution, Money, Public Amusements and Art. Of these the longest chapter is that on architecture. It is divided into numerous heads such as Materials and Methods of Construction; Walls, Towers, Gates, and Bridges; Temples; Fora, Basilicae, etc.; Triumphal Arches; Baths; Theatres, Amphitheatres, and Circi; Public Libraries; Aqueducts, Sewers and Drainage-works; Harbours; The Town House; The Country House; Tombs. This elaborate subdivision is found in all the chapters, thus making the account continuous, and yet separate enough for ready reference. The information is accurate, and is grouped in such a way that a particular subject may be referred to without reading a whole chapter. In general the book is an excellent reference-book for all the subjects it contains. There are some defects, but they are neither many nor serious. In the chapter on Architecture there is an unnecessary amount of archaeological detail, such as isolated measurements of parts of temples; and the same criticism

might be made of the section on Roman Camps. In the chapter on Religion it seems strange that no mention is made of the Jewish and the Christian religions, seeing that those of Cybele, Isis, and Mithra are discussed. There is an error in the statement on page 310, that "... in 129 B.C. we hear of protective measures on behalf of the Italian vine-grower", etc. The order issued at that time by the Roman government was a particular instance and was issued more to please the city of Marseilles, with which Rome had just made a treaty, than for any protection of Roman vine-growers (compare American Historical Review, January, 1913, page 237, Mercantilism and Rome's Foreign Policy). The list of trades included in the chapter on Production is confined very largely to those of Rome; a list of trades outside of Rome and an account of some typical trade *Collegia* would be a welcome addition.

To each topic is appended a short bibliography which is "to direct the reader who desires to make a further study to fuller sources of information". The list is made up for the most part of standard books; where, however, the results of recent investigation have not found their way into manuals, the reference is to periodical literature. The book is splendidly illustrated with eighty plates and sixty-five figures. There are seven maps, all of which are good; the best, possibly, are those of the German *limes* and that showing the roads and the sea-routes.

The book has the attractive appearance usual to Oxford publications, but the pages could have been made more attractive if they had not been so crowded. In some cases a change of topic is not clearly marked (compare e.g. page 151, where the subject changes from aqueducts to sewers).

But there is one vital defect to such a book, a defect not so much in the book as in the limited field chosen by Mr. Jones. It is not clear why he chose the particular subjects or why he should feel that he must confine himself to subjects which can be illustrated from material remains. A handbook in any field should be an accurate, concise, and convenient reference-book for all subjects usually met with in that particular field, if it is to meet the needs of a student. The fewer subjects contained the less its value. A complete handbook in one volume is impossible, but several more subjects could be treated in a book of reasonable size, as Sandys's Companion to Latin Studies shows. In a reference-book for Roman history there should be a discussion of philosophy as well as of religion, of weights and measures as well as of money. The calendar deserves a place; there should be a chapter on law, and on municipal and colonial systems. Various other topics would be valuable and would not crowd the volume too much—topics such as Roman education, palaeography, Roman daily life. A brief sketch of writers on Roman history from



Tillemont down to the present would be both interesting and valuable.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE.

J. F. FERGUSON.

Aristophanes und die Nachwelt. Von Wilhelm Süss. 1. und 2. Auflage. Leipzig: Th. Weicher (1911). 226 pp.

This is a study of the influence of Aristophanes upon later literature—from the dialogues of Lucian down to a couple of Munich comedies of 1907 and 1908—and of the treatment of his plays by editors and professional scholars—from the ancient scholia down to some very recent doctor-dissertations.

It is hardly surprising to find that Aristophanes has never been a popular poet, as certain other ancient writers have been popular—Vergil, for example, and Ovid, and Horace, and Plutarch. After the Revival of Learning the Plutus was the great favorite of his plays all over Europe, and it continued to be the favorite for three or four hundred years. It fitted the traditional definition of comedy as a 'speculum vitae'. The second in point of popularity—though a very bad second—has been the Clouds, which has always received some attention because of its treatment of Socrates.

The influence of his comedies is found in the curious satire Eckius Dedolatus (c. 1520), in Erasmus's *Senatulus* sive *γυναικοσυνέδριον* (c. 1529), in several passages of Rabelais, in Pierre Le Loyer's *Néphelococugie* (1578), in two or three passages of Ben Jonson and Fletcher, in Racine's *Les Plaideurs* (1668). Fénelon and Fontenelle were hostile to him, Pierre Bayle and Brumoy thought him inferior to Molière, and Voltaire could say (in 1764): "Ce poète comique, qui n'est ni comique ni poète, n'aurait pas été admis parmi nous à donner ses farces à la foire Saint-Laurent; il me paraît beaucoup plus bas et plus méprisable que Plutarque ne le dépeint", etc. But Goethe wrote a satire *Die Vögel*: nach dem Aristophanes (1780). And the nineteenth century saw several important imitations: Platen's *Die verhängnisvolle Gabel* (1826) and *Der romantische Oedipus* (1828), Gruppe's *Die Winde*, Rosenkranz's *Das Zentrum der Spekulation* (1840), H. Hoffmann's *Die Mondzügler* (1843)—the last three are 'Hegel-dramas'—a political satire by R. Prutz, *Die politische Wochenstube* (1845), and three remarkable Greek comedies by Julius Richter—*Ἰπες* (1871), *Χελιδόνες* (1873), *Κόκκυγες* (1874)—which dealt with the prevailing tendencies of classical study, the situation of the Kulturkampf, and the wild financial speculation of the day.

In spite of the promise of its title, Professor Süss's book is concerned mainly with German scholarship and German literature. There is a chapter on "Frankreich im 16. 17. und 18. Jahrhundert", but there is very little said about France in the nineteenth century, and even Rostand's *Chantecler* seems to have been published too late to be men-

tioned. And English literature—except for two or three bits of Jonson and Fletcher which are in all the books—is ignored altogether.

It would have been easy to add many pages on the influence of Aristophanes in England. As early as 1592 Thomas Nashe had an interesting bit of criticism in his *Four Letters Confuted*: "Thee I imbrace, Aristophanes, not so much for thy Comedie of the clowd, which thou wrotst against philosophers, as for in al other thy inuentions thou interfusest delight with reprehension". The comedy *Lingua* (produced before the death of Queen Elizabeth) has the old story of "Socrates abused most grossly, himself being then a present spectator" (2.5). The *Return from Parnassus* (printed 1607) has a fancy borrowed from *Clouds* 373 (2.2). Tomkis's *Albumazar* (1614) has an imitation of *Clouds* 94 ff.: "To thunder at the frontisterion Of great Albumazar" (1.3). Here the only note in Hazlitt's edition explains 'frontisterion' as 'entrance to a house'. There are some delightful quotations from Aristophanes in Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*: see the index to Shilleto's edition. The translations of J. Hookham Frere and B. B. Rogers ought to be mentioned in any chapter on Aristophanes and the "Neuzeit", and so ought Swinburne's version in corresponding meter of *Birds* 685-723. Surely something should be said about Robert Browning's *Aristophanes' Apology* (1875), or a reference might be given to the article by Carl Newell Jackson, *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 20 (1909), 15-73. The *Ladies in Parliament* by G. O. Trevelyan (1866) is still interesting as a product of "the days of chignons and female suffrage". And Matthew Arnold, in his *Poor Matthias*, makes a pleasant use of *Birds* 465-485.

It would have been in order, also, to mention some of the cases in recent years where plays of Aristophanes have been presented in Greek—not only at Athens, but at various English and American Universities. The *Acharnians* was presented at the University of Pennsylvania in 1886, the *Frogs* at the University of Toronto in 1902, the *Birds* at Vassar College in 1902 and at the University of California in 1903. Aristophanes himself has been made one of the characters of a modern Greek comedy, the *Agora* of Demetrio Paparrigopoulos (Athens, 1871).

On page 49 it is said that Frischlin's *Julius Redivivus* was apparently the first humanistic comedy to make some of the characters speak a different language from the others. But in the Cambridge play *Hymenaeus* (edited by G. C. Moore Smith, 1908) one of the characters, *Fredericus Teutonicus*, is made to utter occasional scraps of German and Dutch. And *Hymenaeus* seems to have been produced in 1578-1579, whereas *Julius Redivivus* was not completed till 1584.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY. W. P. MUSTARD.

**THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY** is published by The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, weekly, on Saturdays, from October 1 to May 31 inclusive, except in weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday, at Barnard College, Broadway and 119th St., New York City.

All persons within the territory of the Association who are interested in the language, the literature, the life and the art of ancient Greece and ancient Rome, whether actually engaged in teaching the Classics or not, are eligible to membership in the Association. Application for membership may be made to the Secretary-Treasurer, Charles Knapp, Barnard College, New York. The annual dues (which cover also the subscription to **THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY**) are two dollars. Within the territory covered by the Association (New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia) subscription is possible to individuals only through membership. To institutions in this territory the subscription price is one dollar per year.

Outside the territory of the Association the subscription price of **The Classical Weekly** is one dollar per year.

*Editor-in-Chief*

GONZALES LODGE, Teachers College, Columbia University

*Managing Editor*

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, Columbia University

*Associate Editor*

ERNEST RIESS, Boys' High School, Brooklyn

*Business Manager*

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, New York City

Communications, articles, reviews, books for review, queries, etc., should be sent to the Managing Editor. Inquiries concerning subscriptions and advertising, back numbers or extra numbers, notices of change of address, etc., should be sent to the business manager.

Printed by Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J.

## COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY Summer Session

July 7—August 15, 1913

### GREEK—

Elementary Course	Professor Macurdy
Homer, Iliad	Professor Sturtevant
Lyric Poetry	Professor Macurdy
Greek Art	Professor Bassett
Prose Composition—Advanced Course	Professor Bassett

### LATIN—

Elementary Course	Miss Wye
Elementary Course—Reading, Oral Practice	Miss Wye
Livy, XXI-XXII	Professor Gummere
Horace, Odes and Epodes	Professor Moore
Cicero, Letters	Professor Sturtevant
Roman Comedy	Professor Gummere
Vergil	Professor Knapp
Prose Composition—College Course	Professor Knapp
Prose Composition—Advanced Course	Professor Moore

## Just Published

### Demosthenes—On the Crown

Edited by MILTON W. HUMPHREYS,  
Professor of Greek, University of Virginia  
Price, \$1.25

The latest addition to Smyth's Greek Series. The editor has included everything which thirty years' experience has proved needful or useful for students. The introduction, notes, and critical and historical appendix are adequate and scholarly.

## AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

New York Cincinnati Chicago

### The Library of every Latin teacher

#### SHOULD INCLUDE

JOHNSTON'S Private Life of the Romans . . .	\$1.50
cloth 8vo. 304 pages	
" Latin Manuscripts . . . . .	2.25
cloth 4to. 136 pages	
16 facsimile plates	
" Metrical Licenses of Vergil . . . .	.50
paper 4to. 54 pages	

Copies will be billed "on approval" to teachers and special terms given when the order is for the complete set.

## SCOTT, FORESMAN AND COMPANY

37 East 28th St., New York

## COLLAR AND DANIELL'S FIRST YEAR LATIN

Western High School, Washington, D. C.

For logical sequence in the presentation of paradigms and the fundamentals of syntax, as well as for a happy medium between too much and too little in beginners' books, I consider Collar and Daniell's First Year Latin the best introduction to the Latin language now extant.

EMERSON W. MATTHEWS, Teacher of Latin,

## GINN AND COMPANY

70 Fifth Avenue NEW YORK

## BARSS'S BEGINNING LATIN

A book without padding  
A method which goes straight to the mark  
A means of causing the pupil to know something

**PRICE ONE DOLLAR**

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

Writing Latin, Book I: Second Year Work, Fifty Cents  
Writing Latin, Book II: Third and Fourth Year Work, Seventy-five Cents.

Both of these works have been recently revised on the basis of the Lodge Vocabulary of High School Latin

## D. C. HEATH & COMPANY

BOSTON NEW YORK CHICAGO